

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,346

### **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office action electronically delivered on July 13, 2007. Applicants hereby respectfully request entry of the amendments to claims 1 and 7 and the cancellation of claim 3 as set forth hereinbefore to place the present application in proper condition for allowance. No new matter has been added to the claims by virtue of the present amendments, and reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-2 and 4-13 are earnestly requested.

### **Present Status of the Application**

The Office action has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Yang (USPN 4,855,724, hereinafter "Yang"). Further, the Office action has rejected claims 3 and 4 under U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Koyama (USPN 6,380,919, hereinafter "Koyama"). In addition, the Office action has also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of the applicants' admitted prior art ("AAPA" hereinafter). Claims 9-12 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang.

After carefully considering the commentaries set forth in this Office action and the cited references, Applicants have amended claim 1 by incorporating the limitation recited in the as-filed claim 3 therein, so as to more explicitly define the present invention over the prior art of record. Claim 3 has been correspondingly canceled. Besides, Applicants have also amended claim 7 in the same manner as amending claim

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,346

1 at issue. It is believed that no new matter is added by way of these amendments made to the claims. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, the cited references are deficient to adequately teach the claimed features as recited in the amended claims. The reasons that motivate the above position of the Applicants are discussed in detail hereafter, upon which reconsideration of the claims is most courteously solicited.

**Discussion of the 35 U.S.C § 102 Rejections**

*The Office action has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Yang.*

As described hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claims 1 and 7 because Yang fails to disclose each and every element of the claims under consideration.

With respect to Applicants' claim 1, as currently amended, it recites in parts,

"A liquid crystal panel, comprising:

...

a column driver, ..., and said column driver includes:

an even column driver receiving a portion of the pixel data for driving an even portion of said JxM data lines in said display area, wherein the even column driver receives the sub-pixel data XT and ZT when the period  $T = 4s$ , receives the sub-pixel data YT and ZT when the period  $T = 4s + 1$ , receives the sub-pixel data YT when the period  $T = 4s + 2$ , and receives the sub-pixel data XT when the period  $T = 4s + 3$ , s being a integer; and

an odd column driver receiving a portion of the pixel data for driving

Customer No.: 31561  
 Docket No.: 12851-US-PA  
 Application No.: 10/710,346

an odd portion of said JxM data lines in said display area, wherein the odd column driver receives the sub-pixel data YT when the period  $T = 4s$ , receives the sub-pixel data XT when the period  $T = 4s + 1$ , receives the sub-pixel data XT and ZT when the period  $T = 4s + 2$ , and receives the sub-pixel data YT and ZT when the period  $T = 4s + 3$ ." (Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Yang does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features that are highlighted in the afore-referenced claim 1. More specifically, in the currently amended claim 1, the column driver comprises an even column driver receiving a portion of the pixel data for driving an even portion of the JxM data lines in the display area and an odd column driver receiving a portion of the pixel data for driving an odd portion of the JxM data lines in the display area. In the embodiment of FIG. 5, the sub-pixel data XT, YT, and ZT are red sub-pixel data RT, green sub-pixel data GT and blue sub-pixel data BT, respectively. As depicted in FIG. 5 of the present invention, the liquid crystal on silicon (LCOS) pixels arranged in a delta manner are driven by the even column driver and the odd column driver, and thus the pixel data R0G0B0, R1G1B1, R2G2B2, and R3G3B3 transmitted via the data bus have to be divided. Applicants' FIG. 5 evidently shows that the sub-pixel data of R0 and B0 are sent to the even column driver 411, while the sub-pixel data of G0 is sent to the odd column driver 412 based on the arrangement of the LCOS pixels when the period  $T = 0$ . That is to say, as the period T equals to 0, 1, 2, or 3, the sub-pixel data R0B0, B1G1, G2, or R3 is received by the even column driver, whereas the sub-pixel data G0, R1, R2B2, or B3G3 are received by the odd column driver. Since said

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,346

two-column-driver structure provided in claim 1 at issue has neither been taught nor been suggested by Yang, novelty and non-obviousness of Applicants' claim 1 should be affirmed.

If independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 2 and 5 are allowable as a matter of law because these dependent claims contain all features of their independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Likewise, claim 7 has been amended in the same way as proposed to Applicants' claim 1, and thus claim 7 at issue should be novel, non-obvious, and allowable because of Yang's failure to teach or suggest the two-column-driver structure claimed in Applicants' claim 7.

If independent claim 7 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 8 and 13 are allowable as a matter of law because the dependent claims contains all features of their independent claim 7. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Based on the above, Yang neither anticipates claims 1 and 7 nor anticipates claims 2, 5, 8, and 13 respectively depending thereupon. Thus, the 102 rejections of the aforesaid claims should be withdrawn.

#### **Discussion of the 35 U.S.C § 103 Rejections**

*The Office action has rejected claims 3 and 4 under U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Koyama. In addition, the Office action has*

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,346

*also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of AAPA. Claims 9-12 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang.*

Claim 3 has been canceled, while the limitation recited therein has been incorporated into Applicants' claim 1 to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the prior art of record.

In response to the obviousness type of rejections, it is respectfully submitted that due to Yang's failure to teach or suggest the two-column-driver structure claimed in Applicants' claims 1 and 7 as discussed hereinbefore, and thus the combination of Yang, Koyama, AAPA, and any other references of record also fails to teach or suggest said two-column-driver structure, rendering the 103 rejections of Applicants' claims 1 and 7 moot.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully present that independent claims 1 and 7 patently define over the prior art references. Since claims 4, 6 and 9-12 are dependent claims which further define the invention respectively recited in claims 1 and 7, as a matter of law these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

After the above amendments and remarks are taken into account, the Examiner's kind reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,346

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the presently pending claims 1-2 and 4-13 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date :

Oct. 12, 2007

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw)